

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

No claim amendment has been made. Claims 1-12, 15-23, 26-34 and 36-43 are pending.

In the Office Action, the Examiner withdrew the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. §102 (a) as being anticipated by Habraken, Joe, "Using Lotus SmartSuite Millennium Edition", 09/1998, Que Corporation, pages 337-340 and pages 411-425 (hereinafter "*Lotus*"). The Examiner also withdrew the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. It should be noted that contrary to the Examiner's assertion (Final Office Action, page 2), the Applicant has not made an amendment to overcome the rejection of claims 1-16 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Rather, the Applicant has traversed the Examiner's rejection (Amendment dated February 17, 2004, page 9-10) and the rejection of claims under U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, has been withdrawn in view of the Applicants arguments.

The Examiner, however, has rejected claim 1-12, 15-23, 26-34, 36-38 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a) as being unpatentable over *Lotus* in view of U.S. patent No. 5,704,029 (*Wright*). Claims 39-43 have been rejected as being unpatentable over *Lotus* in view of *Wright* and "Lotus SmartSuite Millennium Edition for Dummies," 1998, IDG Worldwide, Inc. pages 240-252 ("*Meadhra*") (Final Office Action, page 11). These rejections are fully traversed below.

(a) *Lotus* and *Wright* do NOT teach or suggest automatically generating a script by the database program when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has admitted that *Lotus* does NOT teach this feature (Final Office Action, page 4). However, the Examiner has asserted that *Wright* teaches this feature. To support this assertion, the Examiner has noted that *Wright* teaches using a "design menu for creating form fields," and "when a user is prompt for a filed type, the user can select script because the form will fill in automatically using the script" (Final Office Action, page 4).

It is noted that the “field scripts” of *Wright* are used to navigate an electronic form (*Wright*, Col. 9, 11-12). It is further noted that execution of an electronic form can be driven by a field script written in a scripting language, and the scripts can provide common survey functionality such as data validation, field navigation, context sensitive help, data formatting, alert sounds, and dialog boxes (*Wright*, col. 9, 14-19). However, it is respectfully submitted that creating an electronic form using the field scripts of *Wright* does NOT teach or even remotely suggest automatically generating a script by the database program when it is determined during the interview sequence that the script should be generated.

First, the field script of *Wright* is NOT a script that when executed allows a report or layout of a database to be automatically generated. The field script of *Wright* is a script for the field of an electronic form (*Wright*, col. 9, lines 14-17). Clearly, the field script of *Wright* facilitates creation of an electronic form, NOT a script that can generate a report or layout of a database. The scripting feature of *Wright* provides flow of control statements and other functions useful for generation of an electronic form (*Wright*, Abstract).

Second, the field script of *Wright* is NOT generated based on a determination made during the interview sequence (see claim 1). In fact, *Wright* does NOT even remotely suggest generating any type of script based on an interview sequence. The field script of *Wright* is there to implement a survey function used to generate an electronic form based on user responses. Clearly, the field script of *Wright* itself, however, is NOT generated based on an interview sequence.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, the field script of *Wright* does NOT teach this feature. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Wright* cannot possibly teach or even remotely suggest this feature because *Wright* does NOT even pertain to a method for creating a report or a layout for data stored in a database. In fact, *Wright* does not even pertain to a database program. Instead, *Wright* pertains to a system and method for providing computerized forms completion and processing. It is noted that *Wright* describes a form engine that presents a single item or question to the user (*Wright*, col. 3, lines 40-55). However, there is no teaching in *Wright* with respect to generating a report or layout for data stored in a database. Clearly, the form engine of *Wright* is used to generate a form, not a report, about information that is stored.

(b) Lotus, Wright and Meadhra do NOT teach or suggest determining during the interview sequence whether: (a) a leading grand total, (b) a leading sub-summary, (c) a trailing sub-summary, and (d) a trailing grand total should be generated for the layout or report (claim 40)

In the Final office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Meadhra* shows “more than one Leading summary, Body, and a Trailing summary next to the totals” (Final Office Action, page 12). It is noted that Fig. 15.9 of *Meadhra* shows more than one leading summary and more than one trailing summary (*Meadhra*, page 246). Initially, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has NOT even addressed the claimed features of: (b) a leading sub-summary and (c) a trailing sub-summary. Instead, the Examiner has merely asserted that more than one Leading summary and Trailing summary are shown by *Meadhra*. The claimed invention, however, does not recite: more than one Leading summary and more than one Trailing summary. The claimed invention recites: (a) a leading grand total, (b) a leading sub-summary, (c) a trailing sub-summary, and (d) a trailing grand. Clearly, the Examiner’s rejection is improper and should be withdrawn because it does NOT address at least two features of the claimed invention, namely, a leading sub-summary and a trailing sub-summary.

Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner’s assertion is improper because it does NOT address: determining during an interview sequence whether these components (a-d above) should be generated for a layout or report (see, also, claim 39). The mere assertion that one or all of these features are shown does NOT address the claimed invention. Thus, the Examiner’s rejection is improper and should be withdrawn for additional reasons.

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Meadhra* does NOT teach or suggest determining during the interview sequence whether one or more of: a leading grand total, a leading sub-summary, a trailing sub-summary, and a trailing grand total should be generated for the layout or report (claim 39). As such, *Meadhra* cannot possibly teach or suggest generating these reports or layout components when it is determined during the interview that one or more component should be generated. The deficiency of *Meadhra* is believed to be evident because the report assistant described in the

tutorials of *Meadhra* does NOT allow generation of leading or trailing sub-summaries based on an interview sequence.

(c) Lotus, Wright and Meadhra do NOT teach or suggest several other features of the claimed invention

It is respectfully submitted that several other features of the claimed invention have NOT been addressed by the Examiner. These features include: (a) determining based on the interview sequence whether the report or layout should include a body, (b) placing the grand total in a leftmost position in a grand total area when it is determined that report or layout should not include a body, (c) determining based on said interview whether the grand total to be placed is dependent on a field to be placed in the report or layout, (d) placing the grand total in a grand total area based on the placement of the field to be placed when it is determined that grand total to be placed is dependent on a field to be placed, and (e) placing the grand total in a leftmost position in a grand total area in the report or layout when it is determined that grand total to be placed is not dependent on a field to be placed (claim 41).

Other features which have NOT been addressed by the Examiner include: (a) determining based on the interview sequence whether placement of a leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body of the report or layout only when it is determined based on said interview that the report or layout should include a body, and (c) placing the leading or trailing sub-summary in a sub-summary area in the report or layout based on the placement of the field that is to be placed in the body when it is determined based on the interview sequence that the placement of the leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body (claim 42).

Yet other features which have NOT been addressed by the Examiner include: (a) determining based on the interview sequence whether placement of a leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in a position other than the body only when it is determined based on said interview that the report or layout should include a body; and (b) placing the leading or trailing sub-summary in a sub-summary area in the report or layout based on the placement of the field that is to be placed in a position other than the body in the report or layout when it is determined based on the

interview sequence that the placement of the leading or trailing sub-summary is dependent on a field that is to be placed in the body (claim 43).

Moreover, in view of the general deficiencies discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of the *Lotus*, *Wright* and *Meadhra* do NOT teach or suggest any of these additional features.

Conclusion

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

If there are any issues remaining which the Examiner believes could be resolved through either a Supplemental Response or an Examiner's Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Applicants hereby petition for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 500388 (Order No. CLARP026).

Respectfully submitted,

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



R. Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 778
Berkeley, CA 94704-0778
(650) 961-8300